

Prices and Subscriptions: Single copies, 25¢ per copy; 50¢ per copy for 100, payable in advance.
Address: FREDERICK DOUGLASS, Jr.,
Lock Box 31, Washington, D. C.

COMMUNICATIONS.

[The New National Era does not hold itself responsible for views expressed by correspondents. Well written and interesting communications will be gladly received.]

Letter from Minneapolis.

To the Editor of the New National Era:

Those of us in the South are grieving to see so much contention between our Republican friends and the dear old leaders of our great party at the North. We have read earnestly the discussions between the New York Tribune, Harper's Weekly, the Golden Age, the New National Era, and the Independent during the past year as to the best candidate for the next Presidency. And we cannot conceal the fact that the waters are troubled, and that there may be breakers ahead. In several letters from leading men in the North, and from members of Congress representing Southern States, we were, and are even now, asked: "How stands your State on the Presidency?" There is no doubt of Mississippi being thoroughly Republican, and supporting the Philadelphia nomination, whoever it may be. But we are forced to ask the question, why this division? The name of Charles Sumner is dear to our heart of hearts, and we would prefer to sacrifice any other in the party than him. Cannot something be done to unite the leading men of the party? Schurz, though having done great good for freedom during and since the war, we feel like condemning for his course in the last Missouri campaign. But Sumner, Greeley, Tilton, and those who signed the New York pronouncement, and others of lesser lights, we certainly cannot afford to lose. Grant has a strong hold on the Republicans of this State on account of his victories here; but the State would go for the party if another were to receive the nomination. We do not mean to write in the clamor of denouncing Grant. He has certainly fulfilled his promises, especially those made to us, but do these entitle him to renomination at the risk of dividing the dear old party? Would not Gen. Wade, Senator Morton, Henry Wilson, B. S. Boutwell, Schuyler Colfax, ex-Governor Claflin, ex-Governor Hawley, or any other of our old leaders of the party unite it and make it formidable for the next Presidential campaign? We would have named Charles Sumner in the above list, but he is so prominent in the opposition fight that we know he would not unite the party. Why persist in nominating Grant? We are not crossing such a rapid stream that another could not take us safely across.

The Independent talks of reading Greeley and others out of the Republican party if they endorse the Cincinnati Convention. We are not much of a disciple of Greeley, but if we are quick in reading some of the founders of the party out of it, we had better take care that we don't read Mr. Tilton out of existence. A remark Mr. Tilton made in last week's Golden Age seems to have some weight, viz: If some other good, reliable, strong, and well-known Republican than Grant could be spoken of for the nomination at Philadelphia, the Cincinnati Convention would disband before it meets. If something could be done, without sacrificing one iota of the principles of the party, to unite it, and have all the dear old leaders clasp hands and work shoulder to shoulder during the Presidential campaign, we would give the Democratic party its certain death-blow, and send it hurrying down the stream of oblivion. But so long as there is division among our leaders, we will be by our own acts infusing new life into its decaying carcass.

When Lincoln was renominated we were in the midst of a terrible war, and it was not safe to change hands at the helm; but now we are at peace, and almost any one of a dozen of the old leaders of the party could carry on the good work now in progress. Do not understand us as being opposed to Grant. Our only fear is, that the party may be divided by insisting upon his renomination, while another may unite it. We have too much at stake to see division in our ranks, and all we ask is, for some measure to unite all the differing elements. Mississippi may be depended upon, however, for the nominee.

In our last, we were rejoicing over the passage of our civil rights bill. But while in the clerk's hands in the Senate, after its passage, and just before going to the Governor for his signature, some contemptible scoundrel stole it, and nothing can be found of it. Mr. Carter, of this county, the originator and the prime mover of the bill, introduced another a week or ten days ago, got it through the House, but in the excitement of the closing hours of the Senate it failed to receive support and was defeated.

So we shall have to bear insults and contempt another year. At the next session, however, another bill will surely be presented, and our friends will watch it more closely. When we wrote to you of the bill abolishing Alcorn University, we were informed by one of our representatives of its passage through the House; and that it would certainly pass the Senate; but it did not succeed. It failed in the Senate, and the University still exists.

WASHINGTON, April 21, 1872.

To the Editor of the New National Era:

In your last issue, under your caveat alleging that you do not hold yourself responsible for the views expressed by correspondents, but that you gladly receive all well written and interesting communications, I notice a letter from D. A. S., which is one of the most malicious and grossest slanders against a most honorable and worthy gentleman which can be conceived.

This writer begins his article by giving a very learned and profound definition of the word "caste," including its etymology, history, and present significance, and then proceeds to condemn all caste as "degraded," "loathsome," and "mongrel." These epithets, when applied to that caste which is founded upon the color of the skin, are eminently proper. I will not allow any one to go further than I do in abhorrence of any discrimination which is based upon so unjust, petty, and contemptible a criterion. But there is a kind of caste which I favor, and which must exist with all cultivated and enlightened people. I believe in that caste which is based upon intelligence and morality. I believe in the superiority of education over ignorance, of honesty over corruption, of cultivation and refinement over rude-

VOL. III.—NO. 16.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1872.

ness and barbarism; and I can have no respect for him who disregards such distinction.

But it is not my present purpose to dispute your correspondent's faulty philosophy on caste. It is only by a simple statement of truth that I hope to repel the imputation of an unworthy prejudice which D. A. S. seeks, by an egregious misrepresentation of facts, to fix upon an eminent colored citizen of acknowledged ability, education, and refinement. If this misrepresentation was willful, it was most malignant, and ought to brand its author with the stamp of slander. If the author was not personally cognizant of the facts, but has made the statement upon the assertion of others who have misinformed him, he is still culpable, and should at least retract. A man may not blamelessly give credence to idle rumor, and then add confirmation and currency to it by publishing it as fact. When a gentleman's reputation may be affected thereby, it is not sufficient that the author hide himself behind so paltry a defense as "I was told it was so." He should know where he speaks.

While D. A. S. did not name the individual whom he assailed, yet his description was sufficiently definite to make it clear to most, if not to all, to whom he referred. But, in order that I may not be charged with giving the insult greater publicity and definiteness in my vindication than it originally had, I will be equally impersonal. The facts, as I shall state them, are not gleaned from any media or hearsay evidence, but are derived from personal knowledge. In addition, I may say that I know the motives which actuated the gentleman in his conduct, (so far as it is ever possible for one person to understand the motives of another.) But what are the grounds for this invective of D. A. S.—which it is not the fault of his intention if they do not rival the Philippics of Demosthenes. Let us see.

This gentleman, while sojourning in this city, attended one of our largest and finest white churches. Our church disavows all prejudice or discrimination on account of color, and, consequently, it is largely attended by colored people. But this gentleman soon observed (what must be perceived by any one entering that church) that colored persons seemed always excluded from the more prominent portions of the church, and were invariably confined to the certain three or four rows of seats. Beyond a certain point no negroes were permitted to penetrate. The reason assigned for this was that the others were rented pews. But this gentleman did not like this "black belt," which gave every appearance of proscription, and, in order to test the validity of the excuse, and the sincerity of the profession of unprejudiced sentiments on the part of the church, made application to rent a pew. The pew assigned was adjacent to the prescribed section, however, and, therefore, the question which he had attempted to solve was still dubious and unsettled, although it was said that that was the best pew then unoccupied. Nor did subsequent events tend to remove the suspicion that the old negro hate still lived and lingered in that sanctuary. Rented pews had hitherto been regarded as inviolable, if not by white, at least by colored, visitors. The sextons had been assiduous in the maintenance of this rule. But upon entering this gentleman invariably found his pew partially occupied. He cheerfully submitted to this, however, having no objection to allowing visitors to share his pew when there were not enough of his own family or friends to fill it. On one occasion when he required the entire pew he was obliged politely to request some persons to vacate it. But he soon observed that only colored and no white visitors were ever put into his pew; while that, if white persons were, certainly no colored persons were ever placed in any white man's pew. This became so apparent that he decided to mention it to the pastor. He told the pastor plainly that there appeared to be a decided exhibition of prejudice notwithstanding their professions of Republicanism. He said he was not ungenerous. He would willingly share his pew, when convenient, to strangers, whether white or black. But he objected to any system of proscription. Justice required that he should be put upon the same footing with other pew-holders. He declared that no discrimination should be made in the selection of the strangers who were placed in his pew; that a white man should be placed there as readily as a colored one. And he demanded, further, as a requirement of justice, that colored people should also be placed in white people's pews. The minister claimed to be ignorant of the custom, but said that every pew-holder had a right to object to any one coming into his pew, and that if members refused to allow colored persons in their pews he had no power to compel them to do so. He would, however, he said, on the succeeding Sabbath, publicly request those who objected to receiving strangers in their pews to leave a note to that effect in them, and that he would then specially instruct the sextons to place strangers, regardless of color, in the pews of all those who did not thus object.

In compliance with his promise the pastor did make the announcement. And this is the "rebutte" our friend received, as D. A. S. alleges. Why, so far from being a rebuke, it was a furtherance on the part of the pastor of the gentleman's endeavor to break down the unholy prejudice! But it is needless to comment further. The facts speak for themselves, and no one who has the true interests of the colored race at heart can utter one syllable of reproach; but, on the other hand, must commend and give thanks to the gentleman for his bold and righteous assertion of equal rights. This gentleman, so far from "deserting his race when needed, and rushing to ease and luxury," has periled his life in laboring for the interests of his race and the Republican party in the very heart of the Ku-Klux district in the most dangerous times. The letter of D. A. S. is a poor return for such heroic and sacrificing conduct. Indeed D. A. S. would seem to have a mania for rushing into print with onslaughts upon somebody. It makes no difference how un-just the criticism so long as it affords him an opportunity to appear in print. In conclusion, let me hope that in the future D. A. S., in his anxious zeal to find something to write about, will not allow his passion to override his reason.

OSCAR.

A NATIONAL SCHOOL.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 20, 1872.

To the Editor of the New National Era:

A national school, in which all the branches

of education are taught, within whose walls no demagogues lurch or false sycophants sing, whose teachers are efficient and loving, above all, genuine friends of the negro race, which is to-day the dupe of the negative know-nothings, and the cat's paw for drawing money from the Government chest to make rich men and women whose hearts are strangers to the elevation of an oppressed race, and who go frenzy at the idea of equality—is the great need of this Republic. It is no less singular than true that our schools, like our public offices, are too often occupied by unfit persons. Men and women entirely unknown, who, from their obscurity, seek light among the subtle sons and daughters of our people. What an anomaly! Not entirely so, since, in the line of duty, a pupil can find sufficient light in a corner, and much more so upon a hill, to enable them to plunder. I have found, through personal experience, that the greatest curse which can fall upon an institution of learning, is to connect it with politics, and thus sacrifice its pupils by hecatombs to the sacrifice of demagogues, whose constant tune is no "longer pipe, no longer dance." We can lay our finger upon such an institution which is a whitened sepulchre and full of dead men's bones. In it, there are not six living, loving teachers of the race of the people, but in the face of extravagant bills for fuel, students are told if they want heat, carry the water themselves to the boiler. Two of their best teachers removed—one because she is too familiar with the colored people, and for this reason is snubbed by her white associate teachers, at meals, and at all times—another because he is said to be incompetent to teach colored people although fully competent to teach white, meaning he is too learned. I can back this up by affidavit. I know I ask you a great deal to believe all this, but it is all true, and if placed upon the list of investigations, much will be found rotten in Denmark.

Parson for my digression. A national school, built upon the granite basis of equality, is doubtless one of our great needs. One designed for the education of our composite nationality. We are among the nations of the earth a singularly great nation, being comprised nearly of all others. This makes our need great and diversified. A national school should be one fitted to meet all the wants of human civilization. In such, not only the general branches of education would be taught, but all the professions, arts, and sciences, trades, and a systematic knowledge of every human occupation practiced among civilized nations. It is the interval between the graduation at college and the entering some other seminary, for the profession, or the workshop for the trade, that causes us to have so many young men of no position, object, or pursuit. Let us illustrate. A school in which the seven-year boy or girl may enter to receive a liberal education or study classics, mathematics, and the living languages, and at the close of this, have the opportunity to receive, within the same walls, further instructions in whatever pursuit he or she may select. We will begin at the lowest order of things so-called. If to be a washwoman, a proper knowledge of the action of the sun in bleaching certain things placed under its influence. If to be a cook, as almost all women are in some degree, then a proper knowledge of all that pertain to culinary science—neatness, cleanliness, and order, never excluded. And so on in this line. Now as to men. Let the school be such, that (to be short) whatever you desire to learn, you can be instructed in, where those who have had to do with your early training, can best impart to you. Let manufactures of every description stand its broad acres; let there be fields for the application of agricultural knowledge; schools of politics—in short, a nation within itself. What a source of great riches such an institution would be to a country, can only be understood by practical efforts of the same. Persons having such an institution would no longer have to spend six years in the outside world to know of the things of practical utility. There would be no monotonous, book-worms, and the Hebrew scholar and nothing else; but instead we should have the farmer—a compound—knowing his Greek roots and his potato roots with like efficiency. At some other time I will continue my views on this subject.

JUSTITIA.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROTECTION AND FREE TRADE.

The relative influence of protection and free trade upon the industry of the country may be summed up in a few words. The effect of protection is to stimulate industry and lead to prosperity; of free trade, to ruin most of the great interests of the country. The mischievousness of free trade is to be seen in the break down. Protection creates a demand for labor and secures it an adequate reward; free trade is designed to lessen that demand and diminish the price of wages. Protection opens mines, erects furnaces, establishes mills, and gives employment to thousands of men; free trade puts out the fires in the furnaces, silences the trip-hammers, arrests the spindles, and drives the thousands either into less profitable pursuits or deprives them altogether of labor. Protection creates a home market, and free trade destroys them. Protection secures and increases industry; free trade diminishes it. Protection secures good wages; free trade makes them cheap. Protection leads to individual self-reliance and independence; free trade makes us dependent as individuals and a nation upon other nations.

HOW THE TARIFF AFFECTS PRICES.

The strongest and almost the only argument used by free trade theorists against a protective tariff is the allegation that it increases the price of every article upon which it is levied, and to the extent of such tariff. I concede this to be true in respect to all articles not produced in this country, such as tea, coffee, spices, and the like; but I deny the assertion when applied to such articles as are successfully produced here. According to the free trade theory, if the tariff on broadcloths were two dollars a yard, it makes every yard of broadcloth manufactured in the United States of the same quality just two dollars dearer than it would be otherwise. This, they allege, is the tax which the American consumer is compelled to pay to American manufacturers for the sake of their benefit. Every man's common sense will tell him that this whole theory that the consumer and not the foreign importer pays this duty on foreign products is a gross error. If we consider the prices of farm produce at our manufacturing or mining towns, and the quantities consumed by workmen and their families with the prices and quantities of similar products in England, it will be found that the American farmer is largely benefited by the tariff. The home market is the best market, as every farmer well understands.

In the face of the fact that since the present tariff was enacted the people of the United States have enjoyed a season of prosperity unparalleled in the history of the country we

prices! When behind the price fell to three dollars! Whose theory did this establish? According to the theory of free trade, here was a result perfectly mysterious and unaccountable. On the principles of protection the thing was perfectly plain. As soon as the duty imposed secured a market to the American manufacturers of glass, they went to work with all their force, each seeking his own profit and all free to make and sell it as they could, when the astonishing power of competition soon effected this great reduction in price.

In 1844 the duty on English common bar iron was twenty-five dollars per ton and eighty-eight per cent, and its price was then \$61.83 per ton. The price, less the duty, would have been \$36.63 as the cost of producing a ton of iron. In 1846 the duty was lowered to thirty per cent, and in 1857 to twenty-four per cent. According to the free trade theory the result of this reduction of the tariff should have been to reduce the price of iron just to the extent of the decrease in duty. But the fact is quite the reverse, as the following comparison will prove: In 1844 the price of the duty on English bar iron was twenty-five dollars a ton, and the prime cost was \$36.63. In 1846 the duty was reduced to thirty per cent, or more than one-half, which would have lowered the price of iron from \$61.83 to \$36.63, or the \$25.20 difference, if the free traders are right in their theories. But instead of this the cost of production actually increased \$1.50 per ton, an advance of \$1.97 per ton.

The article of lead furnishes another striking instance of the absolute falsity of the free trade doctrine. The duty upon lead in 1845, under the tariff of 1842, was three dollars a hundred pounds, and the price in the New York market during that year was \$3.37 per one hundred pounds. If gentlemen are right, the price of lead should have been only thirty-seven and a half cents per one hundred pounds, less than four mills per pound. But when this duty of three dollars was removed, and a revenue duty of twenty per cent, or seven and a half cents per one hundred pounds, placed on it, the price, so far from going down to thirty-seven and a half cents with this duty of seven and a half cents added, absolutely rose to \$5.67 in 1847 and 1857, to an average of \$5.67 per one hundred pounds. In other words, when the duty was reduced to one-fourth of the former rate, the price nearly doubled.

I will give another instance of a more recent kind, and of a still more striking character. It is the history of three years' experience in the manufacture of steel railroad bars. In 1864 the first steel rails were imported into the United States. They were sold to our railroad companies that year for a price beginning with \$104 per ton, and gradually decreased to \$135. The manufacture of steel rails was begun in the United States in 1867. The foreign rails at once went to \$115 and then to \$110 per ton. In April, 1870, the price was reduced to \$72 per ton, a decrease and saving to railroad companies of more than seventy-five dollars a ton, the result of protection to American steel manufacturers, and the competition it gave them the means of making with the English manufacturers.

As further proof in support of my position, I present the following table furnished to me by Hon. David A. Wells by A. T. Stewart, of New York, both free traders, showing the prices of certain articles under the low tariff of 1860 and the tariff of 1869. It was made, as it is seen, for the year 1869, but all the articles named are now as cheap as they were then, and some of them cheaper:

WHAT IS FREE TRADE?

Absolute free trade in its real sense—which is the ultimate aim of all opponents to American industry—is a repeal of all duties, and every class of foreign imports, the abolition of our custom-house system, and the opening of our ports to the introduction of the products of all nations without fee or charge of any kind. This policy would bring the enormous capital and labor of Europe into direct competition with our own industry, and result in the entire destruction of our manufacturing interests, whether of iron, wool or cotton. By this overthrow of our manufactures, two million workmen now profitably employed would be thrown out of employment, and the ten million five hundred thousand people now supported by their labor deprived of the means of subsistence or compelled to accept European pauper-labor wages. In ten years there would not be a furnace, a brick-mill, or a single factory of any other but the simplest kind of manufactures in existence in all the land. With labor at a third the price it commands in the United States, and the control of the vast capital which long years of protection has enabled them to accumulate, French, German, and German manufacturers could undersell our own to such an extent as to drive them even from their own markets, and, much more, from those of foreign nations, where we are scarcely beginning to gain a foothold. I can scarcely imagine a greater calamity could befall our country generally, and especially to those engaged in our various manufactures, and supporting at least one-fourth of our whole population, than the consequences which would inevitably follow the establishment of free trade as the settled policy of the country.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROTECTION AND FREE TRADE.

The relative influence of protection and free trade upon the industry of the country may be summed up in a few words. The effect of protection is to stimulate industry and lead to prosperity; of free trade, to ruin most of the great interests of the country. The mischievousness of free trade is to be seen in the break down. Protection creates a demand for labor and secures it an adequate reward; free trade is designed to lessen that demand and diminish the price of wages. Protection opens mines, erects furnaces, establishes mills, and gives employment to thousands of men; free trade puts out the fires in the furnaces, silences the trip-hammers, arrests the spindles, and drives the thousands either into less profitable pursuits or deprives them altogether of labor. Protection creates a home market, and free trade destroys them. Protection secures and increases industry; free trade diminishes it. Protection secures good wages; free trade makes them cheap. Protection leads to individual self-reliance and independence; free trade makes us dependent as individuals and a nation upon other nations.

HOW THE TARIFF AFFECTS PRICES.

The strongest and almost the only argument used by free trade theorists against a protective tariff is the allegation that it increases the price of every article upon which it is levied, and to the extent of such tariff. I concede this to be true in respect to all articles not produced in this country, such as tea, coffee, spices, and the like; but I deny the assertion when applied to such articles as are successfully produced here. According to the free trade theory, if the tariff on broadcloths were two dollars a yard, it makes every yard of broadcloth manufactured in the United States of the same quality just two dollars dearer than it would be otherwise. This, they allege, is the tax which the American consumer is compelled to pay to American manufacturers for the sake of their benefit. Every man's common sense will tell him that this whole theory that the consumer and not the foreign importer pays this duty on foreign products is a gross error. If we consider the prices of farm produce at our manufacturing or mining towns, and the quantities consumed by workmen and their families with the prices and quantities of similar products in England, it will be found that the American farmer is largely benefited by the tariff. The home market is the best market, as every farmer well understands.

In the face of the fact that since the present tariff was enacted the people of the United States have enjoyed a season of prosperity unparalleled in the history of the country we

are now asked to imperil that prosperity by abandoning the system which produced it. Why is this demanded? Must we, the people demand it? I answer, no! It is made in the interest of foreign capital and the importers of foreign goods, who desire to get the control of the American market without paying anything for the privilege. To get this market the protective force of the present tariff must be stricken down, our manufacturers must be ruined, and our mechanics and our workmen must all turn agriculturists. The consequence would be to increase our agricultural production, and by the same operation to diminish demand by one grand stroke of policy to multiply producers and reduce consumers. And what must be the consequence of that? Prices of agricultural produce of every kind must fall, and with prices wages.

Mr. DUELL proceeds to illustrate this position by a reference to the disastrous influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at all alarmed about the influence of free trade upon the price of labor in this and other countries, and then continues: I trust the time is far distant when the workmen of this country shall be forced to work for the low wages received by European laborers. I do not desire to see pauperism introduced into this country, but I am not at